DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 357 JC 980 306

TITLE	Faculty Evaluation Official Practices.
INSTITUTION	Central Oregon Community Coll., Bend.
PUB DATE	1997-04-28
NOTE	11p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Rank (Professional); Administrator Evaluation; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; *Faculty Promotion; Job Performance; Peer Evaluation; Performance Based Assessment; Professional Development; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Responsibility; Tenure; Tenured Faculty; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Central Oregon Community College

ABSTRACT

This document provides the official practices for faculty evaluation at Central Oregon Community College. Presented in outline format, it begins with the components for evaluation, which are discussed in greater detail later in the text. It then identifies the categories for evaluation: performance in primary assignment, professional improvement, service to the college, and service to the community. The timeline for evaluation is provided, listing the activities all faculty must perform each year, and the requirements for the first year, second year, and the year prior to promotion or tenure review (or every fourth year). Next is a description of components for evaluation. The following components are described in detail: the designated evaluator, peer evaluation, administrative evaluation, student evaluation, and the annual report of activities. Faculty rank is addressed, including discussions on promotion, eligibility, criteria for promotion, and descriptions of academic rank, which include instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. (Contains a reference regarding the issue of tenure.) (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 357

Central Oregon Community College

Faculty Evaluation

Official Practices

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. B. Queary

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

JC980306

Revised April 28, 1997

FACULTY EVALUATION: OFFICIAL PRACTICES

I. COMPONENTS FOR EVALUATION

Designated Evaluator
Peer Evaluation
Administrative Evaluation
Student Evaluation
Annual Report of Activities

II. CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION

- Definitions of these criteria can be found under the descriptions of academic rank in Part V.

- For the annual record of the weighting of these categories by the promotion and tenure committees, see Chairmoot minutes on conferencing each spring.

Performance in Primary Assignment
Professional Improvement
Service to the College
Service to the Community

III. TIMELINE FOR EVALUATION

A. EVERY YEAR ALL FACULTY

1. Student evaluations performed one term in all sections taught.
2. Faculty member submits Annual Report of Activities to the Vice President via designated evaluator by October 15.
3. Designated evaluator and faculty member discuss student evaluations, Annual Report of Activities, and review Professional Improvement Plan.

B. FIRST YEAR

1. Peer team established.
2. Designated evaluator meets with faculty member and peer team to establish responsibilities and goals. Faculty member may share his or her goals and request feedback.
3. Pre-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
4. Class visits and review of class materials.
5. Post-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
6. Formative feedback submitted to faculty member. (Report not submitted to personnel file.)
7. Peer team members meet with designated evaluator and faculty member to discuss observations.
8. Designated evaluator evaluates for rehire.

C. SECOND YEAR

1. Designated evaluator meets with faculty member and peer team to establish responsibilities and goals. Faculty member may share his or her goals and request feedback.
2. Pre-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
3. Class visits and review of class materials.
4. Post-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
5. Peer evaluators' summative reports submitted to faculty member.
6. Designated evaluator provides written evaluation including summary of peer evaluation reports. (Reports submitted to personnel file.)
7. Vice President for Instruction class visit (generally in the second year).
8. Vice President for Instruction submits report on visit to designated evaluator and faculty member prior to submission to personnel file.

D. YEAR PRIOR TO PROMOTION OR TENURE REVIEW, OR EVERY FOURTH YEAR

1. Designated evaluator meets with faculty member and peer team to establish responsibilities and goals. Faculty member may share his or her goals and request feedback.
2. Pre-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
3. Class visits and review of class materials.
4. Post-visitation conference between faculty member and evaluator(s).
5. Summative report submitted to faculty member.
6. Designated evaluator provides written evaluation including summary of peer evaluation reports. (Reports submitted to personnel file.)
7. When a faculty member approaches consideration for the rank of full professor, the faculty member and designated evaluator jointly decide whether to conduct the review in the fourth year or the year prior to promotion.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF COMPONENTS FOR EVALUATION

A. DESIGNATED EVALUATOR

1. The designated evaluator is assumed to be the department chair, except when an alternative appointment is made by the Vice President for Instruction. The designated evaluator for a department chair is the Vice President for Instruction.

2. The designated evaluator serves as an evaluator and as coordinator and guide of the evaluation process, overseeing the work of peer evaluators and tracking the schedule of evaluation procedures and requirements. Although the designated evaluator coordinates the process, individual faculty members are responsible for ensuring that their personnel files are complete.

3. The designated evaluator's evaluation may also include reference to professionalism and commitment to the institution.

4. Designated evaluators will be trained in the use of classroom observation techniques, along with the peer evaluators, and designated evaluators will undergo additional group training, by Chairmoot, with the aim of ensuring consistency in the evaluation process.

5. Classroom observations, and/or equivalent observation of performance in non-teaching duties, are negotiated and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the designated evaluator.

6. On the Annual Report of Activities provided by the faculty member, the designated evaluator will provide a brief commentary on the year's performance, noting strengths and any areas for improvement. This document should be reviewed with the faculty member, along with student evaluation responses, and be placed in the personnel file.

7. In addition to these annual comments, the designated evaluator provides a full written evaluation, including summaries of the peer evaluator reports, in the second year for new faculty, and after that only in the year prior to promotion or tenure consideration.

B. PEER EVALUATION

1. During the first year of employment, peer teams will be established for a strictly formative purpose. After the first year, all references to peer evaluation refer to summative evaluation.

2. Schedule of Evaluation: Summative peer evaluation will occur in the second year for new faculty, and after that only in the year prior to promotion or tenure consideration. For full professors with tenure, or for others who do not come up for promotion or tenure, summative peer evaluation should take place every fourth year.

3. To promote consistency in evaluation, annual training will be provided in the Fall (at the Annual Retreat) if possible, through the Faculty Development program to those who are working as peer evaluators in that year and to any other faculty members who wish to attend.

4. Make-up Peer Team

   a. Faculty peer evaluators will be selected through consultation among the faculty member, the designated evaluator, and the potential peer evaluator. Peer teams are approved by the Vice President for Instruction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

b. A peer team will be assembled during the first month of the faculty member's contract period.

c. The peer team will consist of the designated evaluator, one member from the faculty member's department or from a related department, and one member from outside the faculty member's department/division.

d. The designated evaluator is responsible for contacting potential peer-team members and requesting their participation on the peer team.

e. Department chairs should keep track of peer team assignments within their departments to ensure that assignments are made fairly among department members.

5. Initial Meeting of Peer Team:

a. The designated evaluator will call an initial meeting among peer team members and the faculty member to discuss peer team responsibilities and establish deadlines.

b. The faculty member is given the opportunity to share individual goals and requests for feedback from the peer evaluators, and to give peer evaluators the opportunity to ask questions and offer suggestions.

6. Classroom Visitations and Review of Materials

a. The number and nature of classroom visitations should be decided upon by the peer team, the designated evaluator, and the faculty member.

b. Each peer team member and the faculty member should arrange a pre-visitation conference to select class meetings for visitation, to discuss specific learning goals for these classes, as well as to continue the dialogue on the relevant background information introduced at the initial meeting.

c. A post-visitation conference should be held promptly (ideally within 48 hours) between the visiting peer team member and the faculty member to debrief on class observations. Follow up visitations and review of additional course materials may be arranged at this point.

d. Peer team members are encouraged to consider classroom materials (syllabi, handouts, assignments, even the faculty member's critiques of student work) in their evaluation.

e. It is important that the peer team serve a mentoring role during the formative evaluation year offering specific, constructive suggestions as well as introducing the faculty member to the procedures and culture of COCC.

7. Final Reports:

a. Formative: Individual feedback should be submitted to the faculty member. Peer teams should meet with the faculty member and designated evaluator to discuss their final observations. At that time, possible concerns for future summative evaluation should be raised. No written report will be submitted to the faculty member's personnel file.

b. Summative: Peer evaluators should be prepared to write complete, detailed reports to offer positive feedback, to provide guidance for further growth (perhaps by identifying goals for the development of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness), and to document perceived problems.

8. The "Peer Evaluation Guidelines" provides guidelines for peer team meetings, classroom peer evaluation, review of classroom materials, and review of unique teaching situations.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

1. The Vice President for Instruction will go through the same training and follow the same methodology as the other evaluators. Vice President or designate reviews all evaluation documents, and under unusual circumstances may conduct an extraordinary evalution. The Vice President will give reports of his or her class visits, generally made in the second year, to the designated evaluator and the faculty member for review, prior to inclusion in the personnel file.

D. STUDENT EVALUATION

1. Written student evaluations, using a campus-wide standard questionnaire, are to be conducted for every faculty member once every year, including every section being taught by the instructor that term. The Vice President of Instruction has set a benchmark of 80% or better of students in the class, as per the fourth week roster, completing evaluations. Therefore, faculty are urged to distribute evaluations on a day when strong attendance is expected. The instructor has the option of attaching to the summary report alternate "number enrolled" figures with an explanation.

2. The following standard procedures will be used for administering student evaluations:

a. the instructor leaves the room.
b. a student volunteer reads a standard statement of explanation and instruction to the class.
c. forms are sealed in the presence of the class and taken to the department secretary or to a secure place by the student volunteer. (NOTE: only evaluations which are contained in that envelope when the secretary receives it will be processed.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

d. results are not reviewed by anyone, other than the typist who compiles the responses, until after final grades are turned in.

3. The summary sheet will show ratings and student comments and will indicate the percentage of enrolled students completing the questionnaire. The summary sheet is distributed to the Vice President for Instruction (this copy will be forwarded to the personnel file), the Designated Evaluator, and the faculty member.

4. Faculty members and Designated Evaluators should meet annually (perhaps when the Annual Report is discussed and signed) to review and discuss the student evaluation results, including identification of faculty strengths and weaknesses.

E. ANNUAL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES

1. The faculty member has the option of attaching a one-page self-evaluation essay to the annual report, perhaps addressing individual goals achieved during the year, or any weaknesses noted in the file.

2. Such documentation as the faculty member has to support the annual report should be kept by the faculty member until requested by the designated evaluator or the promotion or tenure committees.

3. The faculty member and the designated evaluator should review the Professional Improvement Plan as they review the annual report.

4. The annual report is completed by October 15.

V. FACULTY RANK

A. PROMOTION

Central Oregon Community College has used a system of academic rank throughout its history as a means of recognizing the quality of a faculty member's contribution to the College. Considerable effort is undertaken to employ faculty members who are fully qualified in the disciplines, who have the potential for significant personal and professional growth, and who are committed to the goals and philosophy of Central Oregon Community College. Thus, it is expected that faculty members employed at Central Oregon Community College, whatever rank they initially occupy and whatever qualifications they possess on initial employment, will mature as professionals and progress through the ranks to become outstanding faculty members.

B. ELIGIBILITY

Eligibility for promotion should adhere to the following time limits, unless exceptional conditions warrant otherwise:

Instructor: Entry Level

Assistant Professor: A faculty member should be in his/her third year of service at the rank of instructor at the time he/she is first eligible for consideration to be promoted to assistant professor.

Associate Professor: A faculty member should be in his/her fourth year of service at the rank of assistant professor at the time he/she is first eligible for consideration to be promoted to associate professor.

Professor: A faculty member should be in his/her sixth year of service at the rank of associate professor at the time he/she is first eligible for consideration to be promoted to professor.

Note: Persons with significant service of an outstanding nature at other institutions of higher education, or who display extraordinary service at Central Oregon Community College, may be recommended by the President for early advancement to any of the ranks noted above.

C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

1. Performance in Primary Assignment
2. Professional Improvement
3. Service to the College
4. Service to the Community

D. DESCRIPTION OF ACADEMIC RANK

Although each rank has specific criteria to be examined during promotions deliberations, there are fundamental assumptions (most of them obvious) which pertain to all faculty and are not grounds for promotion. These are:

1. The faculty member satisfactorily performs his/her assignment.
2. The faculty member is competent is his/her field. Competency implies that one keeps current in one's field.
3. The faculty member acts professionally and ethically.
4. The faculty member shares in the extra-teaching responsibilities of the College.
5. The faculty member shows a willingness to undertake appropriate new efforts on behalf of the College and his/her professional associates.

INSTRUCTOR

This rank, the rank at which many faculty are hired, carries with it the expectation that points one through five, above, are valid.

In addition to these characteristics common to all faculty members, the following criteria are considered necessary to the ranks beyond instructor:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

1. Performance in Primary Assignment: Evidence of above average teaching ability or, in the case of non-teaching faculty, evidence of above average performance in one's assignment. The individual shows regular, significant improvement in the quality of teaching or performance in non teaching assignment. The individual contributes to maintenance and development in his/her curricular or program area.

2. Professional Improvement: The individual steadily pursues a current professional improvement plan. Commitments are being met or exceeded. The individual remains current in the discipline and is progressing toward significantly greater competence.

3. Service to the College: The individual is increasingly involved in college affairs and is an active participant in affairs of the department or division.

4. Service to the Community: The individual demonstrates willingness or promise of meaningful service to the community. Advisory boards, consulting with industry or school districts on curricular matters, and public service in a professional or personal capacity are some examples of such service.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

1. Performance in Primary Assignment: The individual clearly shows continued improvement and refinement of teaching ability or of performance in the primary assignment. The individual has contributed significantly to maintaining and developing the existing curriculum or program area.

2. Professional Improvement: The individual has initiated and actively pursued an approved professional improvement plan. The activities pursued and accomplished are demanding and clearly contribute to the individual's competence and to the goals of the College.

3. Service to the College: The individual is an active participant at the department or division level and frequently makes contributions outside the department.

4. Service to the Community: The individual has demonstrated willingness to provide service to the community especially in the areas of one's professional competence.

PROFESSOR

1. Performance in Primary Assignment: The individual continues to demonstrate regular and significant improvement and refinement of teaching ability or of performance in the primary assignment. The individual

has demonstrated leadership in curricular or program development.

2. Professional Improvement: The individual has a long term record of broad commitment to professional growth. The individual has an exemplary and current plan for professional improvement. The activities are challenging, actively pursued, and clearly contribute to the individual's competence and to the goals of the College.

3. Service to the College: The individual consistently seeks opportunities to be involved in leadership on the campus.

4. Service to the Community: The individual will demonstrate a consistent meaningful service to the community, especially as an expert resource.

VI **Tenure:** Candidates and Chairs are encouraged to refer to the Tenure Committee's Report on Procedures and Practices.

College Affairs 4-28-97

BEST COPY AVAILABLE